

# **State Template for the Consolidated State Plan Under the Every Student Succeeds Act**



**U.S. Department of Education**  
OMB Number: 1810-0576  
Expiration Date: November 30, 2019

**Paperwork Burden Statement** According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless such collection displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0576. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 2181 hour per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this collection, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4537. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this collection, write directly to: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, DC 20202-3118.

Dear Hoosiers,

Today, the Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is proud to share with you the first draft of Indiana's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) plan. ESSA was a bipartisan law, passed in 2015 by a Republican-majority Congress and signed by a Democratic president. Our Indiana plan, which is an explanation of how we will implement the law, reflects the input of over 400 stakeholders – teachers, families, administrators, school support personnel, community and business leaders, and state policymakers. ESSA provides us the opportunity to make important changes as we pursue the best for our students.

ESSA is the replacement to No Child Left Behind (NCLB), a federal law in place since 2002. ESSA offers states more flexibility and autonomy in decision-making. For example, while Indiana is still required to have a school accountability system, we have the flexibility to add a new, non-academic indicator of student success. Instead of choosing how we support struggling schools from a federally-chosen list, we have the flexibility to develop our own innovative approaches to school improvement.

ESSA also provides states an opportunity to better support a variety of student subgroups including special education students, English Language Learners, students of color, and economically disadvantaged students. As a state, we have set long-term goals for improvements in these subgroups, and we also have a responsibility to provide schools support if students in these subgroups are not succeeding.

### **The Indiana ESSA Plan**

Indiana's ESSA plan is divided into six sections. Some sections are longer than others. For example, we had only a few short questions to answer in Section 3: Academic Assessments. However, in Section 4: Accountability, Support and Improvement for Schools, we had to describe our accountability system and provide a brief overview of how we will support schools that are struggling. The six sections of Indiana's ESSA plan are:

1. Long-Term Goals
2. Consultation
3. Academic Assessments
4. Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools
5. Supporting Excellent Educators
6. Supporting All Students

In the **Long-Term Goals** section, IDOE identifies three proficiency goals we must set for the state – an academic achievement (student proficiency) goal, a graduation rate goal, and an English Language Learner (ELL) proficiency goal for all students and each subgroup. We had a choice to make in this section. Instead of choosing a single proficiency number for each subgroup (e.g., every student will achieve 90% proficiency by 2023), we decided to set goals based on each subgroup's baseline proficiency goal. For our academic achievement, graduation rate, and English Language Learner goals, we will work to cut our proficiency gap in half by 2023.

Under the **Consultation** section, we describe the vital stakeholder engagement process our state undertook to develop this plan. We describe our nine community meetings across the state, four technical working groups advising our section drafters, and the individual meetings with interested organizations, and ongoing consultations with the Governor’s office, Indiana State Board of Education (INSBOE) members and staff, the Indiana General Assembly, and other key stakeholders.

While the IDOE plays a crucial role in administering the state assessment system, we only have two small items we are required to report to the federal government in the **Academic Assessments** section.

In the **Accountability, Support and Improvement for Schools** section, we outline our recommendations for changes to our state accountability system. These changes include our recommendation for a non-academic indicator based on attendance. It is very important to note the INSBOE has final say over policy changes to our accountability system, so this section should be read as IDOE’s recommendation.

The **Supporting Excellent Educators** section illustrates how we support classroom teachers and principals throughout their career – from recruitment into the profession, to supporting the teacher preparation process, to induction into their school and district. We also discuss how we will work to support the creation of teacher career pathways and how we can help schools and districts develop policies to retain our great educators for our students.

As a law, ESSA is very clear every child must be developed and supported. Our **Supporting All Students** section outlines how we plan to support the diverse students in our state regardless of background, differently-abled status, race, religious affiliation, ethnicity, or gender identification. We ground this section in Indiana’s vision for a Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS), a framework to provide academic, behavioral, and social-emotional support, grounded in culturally responsive practices.

#### **Timeline:**

Below is our ESSA timeline outlining the steps we must take to submit our state’s final plan on September 18, 2017 to the US Department of Education.

Phases	Notes	Dates
Internal Planning		January - March 1, 2017
Stakeholder Engagement	Community Meetings	March 1 - April 30, 2017
Writing the First Draft	Support from Technical Working Groups	May 1 – June 30, 2017
First Draft Feedback	Public Comment through Online Survey; Presentation to the INSBOE on July 12	July 1 – August 1, 2017 (Survey closes July 20, 2017)
Submit the Plan to the Governor	Must be 30 days before the plan is due	August 15, 2017
Submit final ESSA Plan to US Department of Education		September 18, 2017

As you review the Indiana ESSA plan, we have an important request for you.

***Please provide us with feedback.*** We have posted online surveys with specific questions where section drafters need more public input. Please respond to those questions, and please also add comments regarding other suggestions or feedback you may have. The survey is open until July 20, 2017.

We want to thank the hundreds of stakeholders who helped us develop this first draft of our ESSA plan. Thank you for all of your work in helping us.

DRAFT

## Introduction

Section 8302 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)<sup>1</sup>, permits the Secretary to establish procedures and criteria under which, after consultation with the Governor, a State educational agency (SEA) may submit a consolidated State plan designed to simplify the application requirements and reduce burden for SEAs. The Secretary must establish, for each covered program under section 8302 of the ESEA, and additional programs designated by the Secretary, the descriptions, information, assurances, and other material required to be included in a consolidated State plan.

The U.S. Department of Education (Department) encourages each State to think comprehensively about implementation of programs across the ESEA and to leverage funding to ensure a focus on equity and excellence for all students as it develops its consolidated State plan. Further, the Department aims to support collaboration and efficiency across multiple programs to help ensure that all children have significant opportunity to receive a fair, equitable, and high-quality education and that each SEA works to close achievement gaps.<sup>2</sup>

The Department identified five overarching components and corresponding elements that integrate the included programs and that must be addressed by each SEA electing to submit a consolidated State plan. These components encourage each SEA to plan and implement included programs in a comprehensive way to support local educational agencies (LEAs), schools, and all subgroups of students. Consistent with the Secretary's authority in 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d) to establish the date, time and manner for submission of the consolidated State plan, the Department has established this template for submitting the consolidated State plan. Within each component, each SEA is required to provide descriptions related to implementation of the programs the SEA includes in the consolidated State plan. The consolidated State plan template includes a section for each of the components, as well as a section for the long-term goals required under the statewide accountability system in section 1111(c)(4)(a) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 299.17(a).

The sections are as follows:

1. Long-Term Goals
2. Consultation and Performance Management
3. Academic Assessments
4. Accountability, Support, and Improvement for Schools
5. Supporting Excellent Educators
6. Supporting All Students

When developing its consolidated State plan, the Department encourages each SEA to reflect on its overall vision and how the different sections of the consolidated State plan work together to create one comprehensive approach to improving outcomes for all students. The Department encourages each SEA to consider: (1) what is the SEA's vision with regard to its education system; (2) how does this plan help drive toward that vision; and (3) how will the SEA evaluate its effectiveness on an ongoing basis?

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, citations to the ESEA refer to the ESEA, as amended by the ESSA.

<sup>2</sup> In developing its consolidated State plan, each SEA must meet the requirements section 427 of the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) and describe the steps it will take to ensure equitable access to and participation in the included programs for students, teachers and other program beneficiaries with special needs.

## Instruction for Completing the Consolidated State Plan

Each SEA must address all required elements of the consolidated State plan. Although the information an SEA provides for each requirement will reflect that particular requirement, an SEA is encouraged to consider whether particular descriptions or strategies meet multiple requirements or goals. In developing its consolidated State plan, an SEA should consider all requirements to ensure that it develops a comprehensive and coherent consolidated State plan.

### Submission Procedures

Each SEA must submit to the Department its consolidated State plan by one of the following two deadlines of the SEA's choice:

- **April 3, 2017;** or
- **September 18, 2017.**

The Department will not review plans on a rolling basis; consequently, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(2)(ii), a consolidated State plan or an individual program State plan that addresses all of the required components received:

- On or prior to April 3, 2017 is considered to be submitted by the SEA and received by the Secretary on April 3, 2017.
- Between April 4 and September 18, 2017 is considered to be submitted by the SEA and received by the Secretary on September 18, 2017.

Each SEA must submit either a consolidated State plan or individual program State plans for all included programs that meet all of the statutory and regulatory requirements in a single submission by one of the above deadlines.

The Department will provide additional information regarding the manner of submission (e.g., paper or electronic) at a later date consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(2)(i).

### Publication of State Plan

After the Secretary approves a consolidated State plan or an individual program State plan, an SEA must publish its approved plan(s) on the SEA's Web site in a format and language, to the extent practicable, that the public can access and understand in compliance with the requirements under 34 C.F.R. § 200.21(b)(1)-(3).

For Further Information: If you have any questions, please contact your Program Officer at OSS.[State]@ed.gov (e.g., OSS.Alabama@ed.gov).

## Cover Page

<i>Contact Information and Signatures</i>	
<i>SEA Contact (Name and Position)</i>	<i>Telephone</i>
<i>Mailing Address:</i>	<i>Email Address:</i>
<i>Authorized SEA Representative (Printed Name)</i>	<i>Telephone:</i>
<i>Signature of Authorized SEA Representative</i>	<i>Date:</i>
<i>Signature of Governor (If Applicable)</i>	<i>Date:</i>

The SEA, through its authorized representative, agrees to the enclosed assurances.

## Programs Included in the Consolidated State Plan

*Instructions: Indicate below by checking the appropriate box(es) which programs the SEA included in its consolidated State plan. If an SEA elected not to include one or more of the programs below in its consolidated State plan, but is eligible and still wishes to receive funds under that program or programs, it must submit individual program plans that meet all statutory requirements with its consolidated State plan in a single submission, consistent with 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(iii).*

☐ Check this box if the SEA has included all of the following programs in its consolidated State plan.

**or**

If all programs are not included, check each program listed below for which the SEA is submitting an individual program State plan:

- ☐ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by State and Local Educational Agencies
- ☐ Title I, Part C: Education of Migratory Children
- ☐ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- ☐ Title II, Part A: Supporting Effective Instruction
- ☐ Title III, Part A: Language Instruction for English Learners and Immigrant Students
- ☐ Title IV, Part A: Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants
- ☐ Title IV, Part B: 21st Century Community Learning Centers
- ☐ Title V, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income School Program
- ☐ Title VII, Subpart B of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (McKinney-Vento Act): Education for Homeless Children and Youths Program

## Educator Equity Extension

☐ Check this box if the SEA is requesting an extension for calculating and reporting student-level educator equity data under 34 C.F.R. § 299.13(d)(3). An SEA that receives this extension must calculate and report in this consolidated State plan the differences in rates based on school-level data for each of the groups listed in section 5.3.B and describe how the SEA will eliminate any differences in rates based on the school-level data consistent with section 5.3.E. An SEA that requests this extension must also provide a detailed plan and timeline in Appendix C addressing the steps it will take to calculate and report, as expeditiously as possible but no later than three years from the date it submits its initial consolidated State plan, the data required under 34 C.F.R. § 299.18(c)(3)(i) at the student level.



## Long-term Goals

*Instructions: Each SEA must provide baseline data (i.e., starting point data), measurements of interim progress, and long-term goals for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency. For each goal, the SEA must describe how it established its long-term goals, including its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals, consistent with the requirements in section 1111(c)(2) of the ESEA and 34 C.F.R. § 200.13. Each SEA must provide goals and measurements of interim progress for the all students group and separately for each subgroup of students, consistent with the State's minimum number of students.*

*In the tables below, identify the baseline (data and year) and long-term goal (data and year). If the tables do not accommodate this information, an SEA may create a new table or text box(es) within this template. Each SEA must include measurements of interim progress for academic achievement, graduation rates, and English language proficiency in Appendix A.*

### A. Academic Achievement.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved academic achievement, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) is dedicated to decreasing the student achievement gap for all students. While student assessment data does not measure all the learning and growth in classrooms, student performance correlates with student preparedness for life after K-12 education. With this in mind, Indiana has set the following ambitious, yet achievable goal for our state:

*Indiana will close its student achievement gap in English/language arts and mathematics for all subgroups by 50% by 2023.*

The student achievement gap reduction is calculated by first identifying the 2016-2017 baseline student performance on statewide assessments by subgroup (percentage proficient); subtracting that percentage from 100%; dividing the result by 50%, which represents the gap closure; and adding that percentage to the baseline to identify the long-term goal. For example:

#### **Example Student Achievement Gap Calculation**

Subgroup: All Students (ELA for grades 3-8)

Step 1: 2016-2017 Baseline Proficiency = 66.4%

Step 2:  $100\% - 66.4\% = 33.6\%$

Step 3: Reduction goal is 50% of 33.6% = 16.8%

Step 4: Add reduction goal to baseline proficiency to determine long-term goal (increase in proficiency) for the All Students subgroup  $16.8\% + 66.4\% = 83.2\%$

## Rationale

In looking at the 2016-17 baseline academic achievement data for student subgroups, it is clear that Indiana students are at different points of proficiency. Therefore, setting a common proficiency endpoint (e.g. all student subgroups will be at 85% proficiency by 2023) does a disservice to both struggling students and high achieving students alike. Such a goal would be ambitious, but likely not achievable over a medium-term time horizon.

Instead, Indiana chose to set a common goal of closing the academic achievement gap by 50% by 2023. This is an ambitious goal, as Indiana will need to realize double digit increases for every subgroup over the next six years. It is an achievable goal because the increase for the academic achievement is based on the subgroups' own data.

This approach establishes the same long-term timeframe for all student subgroups, establishes proficiency targets based on the current performance of each subgroup, and expects larger improvements in the same timeframe from subgroups with lower baseline proficiency rates. State progress toward achieving its long-term goals will be monitored by measuring progress against the interim goals at regular intervals.

When considering previous years of student assessment data, it is clear that many subgroups will have to grow at larger intervals year over year than ever before to achieve a 50% achievement gap closure by 2023. African-American students, for example, will need to increase proficiency by 3.9% per year to achieve the gap closure goal; since 2010, the maximum amount African-American students have grown as a sub group is 2.19% (See Appendix A).

**Please note:** Indiana will be adopting a new statewide assessment for the 2018-2019 school year. As such, academic achievement goals will require modification based on the new assessment baseline.

- ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals in the table below.

Grades 3-8 Academic Achievement Long-term Goals									
Subgroup	English/Language Arts					Mathematics			
	Baseline	Year	Goal	Year		Baseline	Year	Goal	Year
All Students	66.4	2016	83.2	2023		59.8	2016	79.9	2023
American Indian	64.4	2016	82.2	2023		56.2	2016	78.1	2023
Asian	78.4	2016	89.2	2023		77	2016	88.5	2023

Black	45.2	2016	72.6	2023		34.7	2016	67.3	2023
Hispanic	54.3	2016	77.2	2023		47.7	2016	73.9	2023
Multiracial	63.6	2016	81.8	2023		54.4	2016	77.2	2023
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	59.7	2016	79.9	2023		59	2016	79.5	2023
White	71.6	2016	85.8	2023		65.6	2016	82.8	2023
Special Education	28.7	2016	64.3	2023		29.8	2016	64.9	2023
English Learners*	55	2016	77.5	2023		51.2	2016	75.6	2023
Free/Reduced Price meal	53.8	2016	76.9	2023		46.2	2016	73.1	2023

## Grade 10 Academic Achievement Long-term Goals

Subgroup	English/Language Arts					Mathematics			
	Baseline	Year	Goal	Year		Baseline	Year	Goal	Year
All Students	59.2	2016	79.6	2023		34.7	2016	67.3	2023
American Indian	58.4	2016	79.2	2023		28.4	2016	64.2	2023
Asian	67.4	2016	83.7	2023		59.2	2016	79.6	2023
Black	36.7	2016	68.4	2023		13.4	2016	56.7	2023
Hispanic	46.7	2016	73.3	2023		21.6	2016	60.8	2023
Multiracial	56.9	2016	78.5	2023		29.8	2016	64.9	2023
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	50.0	2016	75.0	2023		23.4	2016	61.7	2023

White	63.9	2016	82.0	2023		39.0	2016	69.5	2023
Special Education	16.9	2016	58.5	2023		7.8	2016	53.9	2023
English Learners*	45.7	2016	72.9	2023		26.7	2016	63.4	2023
Free/Reduced Price Meal	43.9	2016	71.9	2023		19.7	2016	59.8	2023

*\*English Learner goals are set by looking at students currently enrolled as English Learners as well as students who were reclassified as fluent English proficient within the last 4 years.*

## B. Graduation Rate.

- i. **Description.** Describe how the SEA established its ambitious long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for improved four-year adjusted cohort graduation rates, including how the SEA established its State-determined timeline for attaining such goals.

The Indiana Department of Education (IDOE) believes that all students should finish their K-12 education prepared to embark on their chosen path in life. While the receipt of a high school diploma is not the only way to measure student success in high school, it is an important achievement on a student's path to a successful life. With this in mind, Indiana has chosen to set the following ambitious, yet achievable goal for our state:

*Indiana will close its graduation rate gap for all sub-groups by 50% by 2023.*

The graduation rate gap reduction is calculated by first identifying the 2016-2017 baseline graduation rate by subgroup; subtracting that percentage from 100%; dividing the result by 50%, which represents the gap closure; and adding that percentage to the baseline to identify the long-term goal. For example:

### Example Graduation Rate Gap Calculation

Subgroup: All Students

Step 1: 2016-2017 Baseline Graduation rate = 86.8%

Step 2:  $100\% - 86.8\% = 13.2\%$

Step 3: Reduction goal is 50% of 13.2% = 6.6%

Step 4: Add reduction goal to baseline proficiency to determine long-term goal (increase the graduation rate) for the All Students subgroup  $6.6\% + 86.8\% = 93.4\%$

## Rationale

In looking at the 2016-17 baseline graduation rate data for student subgroups, it is clear that there are differences among Indiana students. Therefore, setting a common graduation rate endpoint (e.g. all student subgroups will be at 95% of students graduated by 2023) does a disservice to both struggling students and high achieving students alike. Such a goal would be ambitious, but likely not achievable over a medium-term time horizon.

Instead, Indiana chose to set a common goal of closing the graduation rate gap by 50% by 2023. This goal is ambitious. This goal is also achievable, because the amount of graduation rate increases is based on the subgroups' own data.

This approach establishes the same long-term timeframe for all student subgroups, establishes rate targets based on the current performance of each subgroup, and expects larger improvements in the same timeframe from subgroups with lower baseline graduation rates. State progress toward achieving its long-term goals will be monitored by measuring progress against the interim goals at regular intervals.

**Please note:** Indiana has adopted a new statewide assessment, starting in the 2018-2019 school year. It changes the requirements for graduation, creating a graduation pathways approach while maintaining participation in a graduation qualifying exam. As such, graduation rate goals will require modification based on the new requirements.

- ii. Provide the baseline and long-term goals for the four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate in the table below.

Graduation Rate Goals by Subgroup				
Subgroup	Graduation Rate			
	Baseline	Year	Goal	Year
All Students	86.8	2016	93.4	2023
American Indian	83.0	2016	91.5	2023
Asian	89.4	2016	94.7	2023
Black	73.8	2016	86.9	2023
Hispanic	82.8	2016	91.4	2023

Multiracial	84.6	2016	92.3	2023
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	80.9	2016	90.4	2023
White	89.5	2016	94.8	2023
Special Education	72.0	2016	86.0	2023
English Learners*	70.9	2016	85.4	2023
Free/Reduced Price Lunch	85.0	2016	92.5	2023

*\*English Learner goals are set by looking at students currently enrolled as English Learners as well as students who were reclassified as fluent English proficient within the last 4 years.*

### C. English Language Proficiency.

- i. **Description.** Describe the State's uniform procedure, applied consistently to all English learners in the State, to establish research-based student-level targets on which the goals and measurements of interim progress are based. The description must include:
  1. How the State considers a student's English language proficiency level at the time of identification and, if applicable, any other student characteristics that the State takes into account (*i.e.*, time in language instruction programs, grade level, age, Native language proficiency level, or limited or interrupted formal education, if any).
  2. The applicable timelines over which English learners sharing particular characteristics would be expected to attain ELP within a State-determined maximum number of years and a rationale for that State-determined maximum.
  3. How the student-level targets expect all English learners to make annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency within the applicable timelines.

More than 112,000 Indiana students speak a language other than English at home, and there are over 275 different languages represented in Indiana schools. Of these, over 50,000 students have been formally identified as English learners due to limited proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, and writing academic English. Indiana is committed to ensuring that all English learners are held to the same rigorous college- and career-ready academic standards as their native English-speaking peers.

Indiana has adopted WIDA ACCESS for ELLs as the state's annual English language proficiency assessment. A student's overall composite proficiency level as determined by their first testing with the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs assessment is considered their initial proficiency level upon enrollment in an Indiana EL program.

Indiana will use a growth to target model to identify the type of movement each individual student made from the prior to current year. Each student will be assigned an annual growth target that is established based on the student's proficiency level upon initial identification as an English learner, the student's grade level, and the student's age. Each year after the student's initial identification and administration of the WIDA ACCESS 2.0, the student is expected to meet his annual growth toward

English language proficiency as defined through the individualized growth targets. Additionally, a student who attains proficiency on the ACCESS 2.0 assessment will be considered to have achieved his annual growth target. The individual student growth target will be reset annually based on the student's actual growth on WIDA ACCESS to account for more rapid growth at lower levels of English proficiency and slower growth at higher levels of English proficiency, and to ensure that the target aligns with the state long-term goal of attaining proficiency within six years.

Indiana's goal is for 63.0% of English learners to attain English language proficiency within six (6) years. The alignment of this goal with the English Language Proficiency Domain of the state accountability system promotes the attainment of this goal within the established timeline, and allows schools to monitor this subgroup annually within the six-year timeline of the state long-term goal.

The WIDA Consortium recently conducted a scoring standard setting for the WIDA ACCESS for ELLs 2.0 assessment. Indiana has only administered the WIDA ACCESS 2.0 assessment for two years, and therefore does not have longitudinal data to confidently and securely determine the statewide goal and timeline for the attainment of English language proficiency for its English learner population. As such, Indiana will revisit the 63.0% threshold and the six-year timeline as more years of data become available to ensure that the goal is sufficiently rigorous and achievable.

- ii. Describe how the SEA established ambitious State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for increases in the percentage of all English learners in the State making annual progress toward attaining English language proficiency based on 1.C.i. and provide the State-designed long-term goals and measurements of interim progress for English language proficiency.

Second language acquisition research shows that the average timeline to acquire academic language proficiency in a second language ranges from five to seven years. Indiana's timeline of six years is designed to align with a research-based understanding of the trajectory of language acquisition and to maintain rigor and achievability. Due to the scoring changes made to WIDA ACCESS for the 2016-2017 administration, and the lack of longitudinal data within Indiana due to transitioning from the LAS Links assessment to WIDA ACCESS and then to WIDA ACCESS 2.0, Indiana has set the long-term goal based on previous English proficiency data and second language acquisition regarding appropriate timelines for language acquisition. After multiple years of reliable ACCESS data are available, Indiana intends to analyze our statewide data in conjunction with the WIDA consortium to determine if adjustments to the state long-term goal are necessary.

Indiana's goal is for 63.0% of English learners (as identified by 2016-2017 baseline data) to attain English language proficiency within six (6) years. The alignment of this goal with the English Language Proficiency Domain of the state accountability system promotes the attainment of this goal within the established timeline, and allows schools to monitor this subgroup annually within the six-year timeline of the state long-term goal.

As indicated above, Indiana will use a growth to target model to identify the type of movement each individual student made from the prior to current year. The individual student growth target will be reset annually based on the student's actual growth on WIDA ACCESS to account for more rapid growth at lower levels of English proficiency and slower growth at

higher levels of English proficiency, and to ensure that the target aligns with the state long-term goal of attaining proficiency within six years.

Subgroup	Baseline (Data and Year)	Long-term Goal (Data and Year)
English learners	WIDA ACCESS 2015-2016: 26% of students attained English proficiency on the WIDA ACCESS assessment	Rather than simply looking at the number and percentage of students attaining proficiency each year, Indiana's long-term state goal is for 63% of students to attain English proficiency within a six-year timeline. Students will be tracked as a cohort within the six year period, and interim progress will be tracked through their annual growth to target measure. By 2023, 63% of Indiana's English learners (as determined by 2016-2017 baseline data) will achieve English language proficiency.